

In the Matter of )  
Amendment of Part 15 )  
regarding new requirements )  
and measurement guidelines )  
for Access Broadband over ) ET Docket No. 04-37  
Power Line Systems )

To the Commission:

Most BPL implementations will likely use a large portion of the High Frequency (HF) radio spectrum. The HF spectrum is a unique, irreplaceable resource. No other medium offers communications hundreds or even thousands of miles without the use of terrestrial- or satellite-based repeaters.

1

world. The foreign nations broadcasting to the US have an expectation that the American government (or its infrastructure) will permit the direct flow of information into Americans' homes. BPL interference represents a threat to this free flow of information.

The Commission must recognize that shortwave broadcast radio remains a viable means for the public to follow world events. It is a highly portable, low-cost alternative that does not require an Internet connection (ISP), monthly charges, or expensive computers and software. In fact, most public libraries do not permit listening to comparable streaming media sources on their free access terminals, thus limiting the Internet as a truly free, replacement audio alternative.

Many BPL field trials have attempted to relieve amateur radio users of direct interference in their spectrum, (i.e. filter placement between 14.0-14.4MHz). Unfortunately no such similar relief has been offered to the shortwave listener community and our WRC-allocated frequencies, e.g. 49 meters (5.9-6.2Mhz). If BPL interference is permitted in the international broadcast bands, my ability will be threatened to hear ITU-allocated broadcasters such as Radio

Nederlands (6.02Mhz) and Radio Canada International (9.755MHz). The US government is a signatory to ITU/WRC treaties and its expectation of jamming-free and/or interference-free listening.

If BPL is to be deployed, data providers must provide equal "quite zone protection" to the international broadcast frequencies (listed in Part 73, FR. Sec 73.702) as they do to amateur radio frequencies.

Military, government, and civilian aid agencies still use HF as critical backup during natural disasters and crisis situations. Implementing a relaxed BPL environment indeed will threaten our disaster recovery capabilities. Gateway radio sites could suffer from heightened levels of Part 15 HF interference, degrading their ability to receive voice and data transmissions.

Today's powerlines are designed for carrying power, not transmitting wideband data. There are already plenty of other technologies that could be employed to provide rural and urban consumers with equal-or-better broadband service without endangering this critical HF spectrum

resource. Among these technologies are MMDS, satellite, data-channel-over HDTV, remote-fiber-MUX DSL, broadband cable.

Today's consumers are overwhelmed with new technological services. In the past the Commission has permitted "corrective measures" to make these services more user friendly. Signals to auto-set VCR/TV clocks, V-Chips, telephony number transparency, RDS are just a few features that aid the consumer.

Industry and the Commission have yet to offer a consumer-friendly method to identify and mitigate potential BPL interference. If power transmission companies potentially generate interference, there must be a simple, standardized technique for the consumer to differentiate BPL interference from other common sources: DSL harmonics, arcing power transformers, motors, automobile ignition noise, etc. Cable TV providers have long used "RF beacons" to identify and mitigate potential interference to aircraft and public safety frequencies.

Consumers must have tools at their disposition to similarly track BPL interference sources. BPL cries out for "decodable" marker frequencies on at least five published frequencies across the spectrum (for example 4.3, 8.1, 10.5, 17.1, 23.8 Megahertz - at the Commissions' discretion). The Commission must mandate all BPL providers implement consumer-readable standardized telemetry streams on marker frequencies. These telemetry streams would assuage many current spectrum users when battling Part 15 BPL interference sources. If BPL is to go beyond the field trial stage, these data providers must also augment the reporting capabilities of their interference hotlines, similar to the "call-before-you-dig" service desks. It will be critical to insure multilingual staffing on these "hotlines" as many shortwave broadcasters "target" their diaspora in the US.

Finally BPL proponents must disclose the full impact of their technology. BPL must be evaluated with government agencies in charge of protecting our regional and local power distribution infrastructures. As "Homeland Defense" has become a major issue, a "Day Zero" evaluation should be mandated with each new BPL rollout. Has there been full disclosure regarding any potential risks to the powergrid

when modified for BPL with its HF and VHF signals? The Commission must allow a residential "opt-out" policy that blocks BPL signals from passing beyond the pole-mounted "customer-entry" transformer.

I believe BPL can eventually be a positive technological force, but only if there is a level playing field. This equal playing field includes aggressive protection for licensed users and shortwave broadcast listeners, consumer-friendly interference identification, and powergrid-under-BPL resiliency testing.

Our spectrum is too unique of a resource to be lost to a partially-developed technology.

Respectfully Submitted,

/s/

(Mr.) Tracy K. Wood

4561 Strutfield Lane #3416

Alexandria, VA 22311-4982

3 May 2004